

OF M. LIBRARY
KHAM BLDG
DETROIT

JUL 14 1950

July 1950

CHILD WELFARE

JOURNAL OF

THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

VOLUME XXIX • NUMBER 7

price 35 cents

CHILD WELFARE

JOURNAL OF THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, Inc.

Published Monthly except August and September, by the Child Welfare League of America

• HENRIETTA L. GORDON, Editor

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION \$3.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

Child Welfare is a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems and the programs and skills needed to solve them. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

CHECKS PAYABLE TO Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

24 West 40th Street, New York 18, N.Y.

CONTENTS

PAGE

A Look at America's Children Today	3
Research Study in an Adoption Program	7
Editorial Comments—John M. Glenn	10
Day Care	11
Readers' Forum	15
Book Note	19
Classified Ad Service	19

COMMITTEES ON PUBLICATIONS

E. MARGUERITE GANE, *Chairman, Executive Secretary, Children's Aid and S.P.C.C., Buffalo, N. Y.*

Policy Committee

MRS. RICHARD L. BOWDITCH

ROBERT L. KINNEY

REV. JOHN J. LENNON

MRS. MEREDITH NICHOLSON, JR.

LOIS WILDY

MRS. CHARLES S. MONROE

Advisory Committee

MRS. RICHARD L. BOWDITCH *Board Member, Children's Aid Association, Boston, Mass.*

SALLIE E. BRIGHT *Executive Director, National Publicity Council for Health and Welfare, New York, N. Y.*

MRS. CLEVELAND B. CHASE *Board Member, St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.*

DR. ROMAN L. HAREMSKI *Director, Children's Division, City of Chicago Department of Welfare, Chicago, Ill.*

ADELAIDE KAISER *Director, Hillside Children's Center, Rochester, N. Y.*

FREDERIKA NEUMANN *Director of Casework Services, Jewish Board of Guardians, New York, N. Y.*

MARY LOIS PYLES *Faculty, Nashville School of Social Work, Nashville, Tenn.*

FRED A. SCHUMACHER *Executive Director, St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.*

RUTH WEISENBARGER *Assistant Director, Sheltering Arms Childrens Service, New York, N. Y.*

A LOOK AT AMERICA'S CHILDREN TODAY*

Leona Baumgartner, M.D.

Associate Chief, Children's Bureau

Social Security Administration

Federal Security Agency

FOR a very definite reason I welcome this opportunity to address this regional meeting of the Child Welfare League of America. I happen to be a public servant. You represent the magnificent spirit of private social enterprise. Both of us are deeply concerned with the well-being of America's children. We meet together today with one objective only in our minds: Together, how can we increase our knowledge and multiply our skills in serving the boys and girls of our nation?

The fact that you invite public and private workers for children to join for this purpose is just another proof, in the long list of proofs your League has given, of your fundamental belief that public and private agencies have a common job to do, that there are many ways of serving children, that there is strength and hope for America's children when all of us combine our knowledge and skills in their service.

Like many of you, I was, until recently, a children's worker in a local community. I knew, rather intensively, the problems of children in one city. Less than a year ago, when I became Associate Chief of the Children's Bureau of the Federal Security Agency, I had to raise my sights to the children of the nation. This challenge has given me a new perspective—one that I should like to share with you, because I think it may help you, as it did me, to see our local jobs against the background of the total job we have to do for America's children.

Just numerically, our responsibilities have grown tremendously in the past 10 years. It is an astounding fact that in 1948 we had 40 per cent more children under 5 years of age than we had in 1940. In that year we had 21 per cent more children from 5 to 9 years of age than we had had the beginning of this decade.

The implications of these figures are grave, indeed. How many of you have had a 40 per cent increase in your budgets for service to preschool children, or 20 per cent increases in your budgets for service to the 5-to-9-year-olds since 1940? And yet this is one of the

basic facts you are up against today in planning your programs. Very few taxpayers or voluntary contributors, I believe, are aware of this enormously increased pressure for service. Just to keep pace with the quantity of services that private and public agencies were giving children in 1940 calls for drastic increases in budgets. If we could only get these simple figures in the minds of people I believe they would face up to their implications. I don't think you and I have done as good a job as we might do to publicize them.

Another fact that I think citizens have been slow to appreciate is the great unevenness in the responsibility adults have for the care of children. Over one half (51%) of our children live in one sixth of our families. These are the families with three or more children. And these are the families that by and large have less per capita income with which to provide the good housing, clothing, medical care, recreation, and other necessities children need for healthy growth. A quarter of all our children in 1948 were in families that had incomes of less than \$2,000 a year. Nearly half were in families whose incomes were under \$3,000.

Now, \$3,000 a year does not buy a lush life for a family with only two children, as the Bureau of Labor Statistics has shown. It cost city families of four persons from \$3,004 to \$3,458 in 1947 to purchase the most modest living. One evidence of the difficulties families have been having in meeting the mounting cost of living is the fact that early in 1949, 29 per cent of all United States families had no liquid assets. In 1948, 3 in every 10 families spent more than they received that year.

Fact No. 3 is this: Just as the money that families have for buying a living for their children bears little relation to the number of children for whom they must provide, so states and regions that are rich in children are usually poorer in financial ability to support services for children. The Southeast, for example, with 57 children under 15 years for every 100 adults of working age, had a per capita income in 1948 of \$957. At the other extreme, the Middle East had 37 children and a per capita income of \$1,647.

* Presented at League's Central Regional Conference, Toledo, Ohio, March 1950.

One southern state had 63 children for every 100 adults of working age and a per capita income of \$758, while one middle-eastern state had 32 children and a per capita income of \$1,891.

These wide variations in the financial capacity of adults to support both children and the services children need are highly significant to public and private agencies. A high per capita income does not necessarily mean that a state is providing services to the fullest capacity. But obviously the lower the per capita income the less able a state is to meet its obligations to children.

Congress, wisely, has recognized this fact in passing the Social Security Act. The basic principle behind this act is that, by pooling our resources, we can help to bring up the quantity and quality of services to children everywhere. This is nothing more or less than the spirit of neighborliness. Using government to do neighborly acts is the essence of democracy. Through the Social Security Act, as individual citizens we are doing neighborly acts for neighbors who live thousands of miles across the country whom we could reach in no other way.

The tremendous movement of people during the war showed many of us how vital it is that we look upon all our citizens as neighbors. The child who grows up in one state, deprived of good medical care, can so easily become the adult who shows up 3000 miles away, broken in health and a charge on his new community. Though the wartime movement of families from place to place has slowed down greatly in the past 5 years, one fifth of the persons in the civilian population in 1947 were reported to be living in a different county or state from the one in which they lived in 1940.

More Health Services Needed

As a doctor, I have a natural and particular concern that this spirit of neighborliness show itself in better health services and medical care for children.

We have a great deal that we can be proud of, as we look at our national record in reducing the deaths of mothers and infants. It is safer to have children and to be a child today than it has ever been before. Thanks to scientific developments, better training of doctors and nurses, better community facilities (both public and private), and some improvement in family incomes, we have pushed down the maternal mortality rate 68 per cent since 1940. If the 1940 maternal mortality rate had held in 1948, we would have lost more than 13,000 mothers, over three times the number that actually died in 1948.

We have slashed the infant mortality rate 32 per cent in the same time. If the 1940 infant mortality

rate had held in 1948, we would have lost 53,000 babies more than the 113,000 we did lose in 1948.

Good as the present rates are, however, they can be brought down still farther; 2,721 more mothers would have lived in 1947 if all states had had as good a record as the best state that year. On the same basis, 27,784 more babies could have been saved.

But staying alive is not an end in itself. How well are our children today? Do they get the kind of care that makes it possible for them to develop as human beings who are buoyantly healthy in body and spirit?

The Academy of Pediatrics, working with the U.S. Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau, has recently completed a nation-wide study which has in it some very thought-provoking figures. You who come from the northeast and central states have reason to be proud of the provisions you make for the medical care of children. You not only have a bigger job to do for children than has any other region of the country—43 per cent of all our children live in the northeast and central states—but you are doing more for them. Fifty-four per cent of all the children throughout the nation who are under medical care on one day are found in this region. Sixty per cent of all the children of the nation under dental care on one day are also in this region.

You are able to do more for children in this region largely because you are richer in medical resources. The number of doctors in private practice for every 1,000 children in the United States as a whole is 3.24. In this region, it is 4.46. The number of dentists in private practice, per 1,000 children, is higher in this region too. In the United States it is 1.8. In the northeast and central region it is 2.5. Eighty per cent of all the child patients of mental hygiene services are located in this region. The number of sessions of well child conferences throughout the country is 11.4 per 1,000 children under 5; in this region it is 16.2—the highest for all regions. Your region provides 67 per cent more public health nursing visits per 1,000 children than the average for the nation. You are providing 13 per cent more services for physically handicapped children than the average for the United States. While 50 per cent of the counties in the United States are without medical service in public elementary schools, in this region the percentage is 29.

This record is commendable and you have every reason to take pride in it. But I hope your entirely justifiable pride does not stop you from considering the plight of children elsewhere in the country, because so many of them, when they are grown, will be citizens of your states, and their health problems will become your health problems if they are not dealt with now where they are living.

Even if we were to do no more than raise the level of medical care and health services in all other regions to the levels you have achieved in the northeast and central states, we would add enormously to the well-being of our next generation. But to do that means we must have more doctors, more hospitals with provisions for child patients, more dentists, nurses, clinics, and other health services. We must give opportunity to the health workers we now have to acquire more specialized training in the needs of children.

Social Services Need to be Expanded

But you who are in the social work field know so well that we have not met our total obligations to children merely when we have given them a healthy body. There are many other social and emotional needs that are equally pressing. We like to think of the "typical" American boy and girl growing up in a family complete with father and mother. But six million children, one in every 8, live with only one parent, with relatives, in foster homes, or in institutions. Many of them are in urgent need of the kinds of services which you are so able to give, but which must be denied them because there are not enough of you. I am thinking, too, of the 275,000 children brought before juvenile courts in a year; the 100,000 babies born out of wedlock annually; the 25,000 children who run away from home; the many thousands of children whose mothers must work away from home for whom there are no day-care services. I am not counting—but you know how sizable the number is—parents for whom the job of parenthood is too difficult but who would welcome and put to good use the wise counsel which you are experienced in giving, if you only had the time and personnel to give it.

We cannot, we dare not, sit complacently by while so many children are trying to grow up under the most adverse circumstances. Whether the help they need reaches them through private auspices or public service is far less important than that it should be readily at hand whenever and wherever it is needed. During this past decade when the number of our children has increased 5 million and when the cost of giving service has increased greatly, many communities have found it almost impossible to keep abreast with the need for service. Some are faced with actual curtailment of services.

Only recently, 22 state child welfare agencies reported to the Children's Bureau that they would have to curtail their services unless more financial support were forthcoming, and quickly, too. This should shock the conscience of all citizens into action. I cannot urge you too strongly to place high in the

activities of your agencies the vital job of getting such facts as these to your communities and states.

There is another broad area in which we should be making greater advances for children: that is in research on the problems of child growth and development.

This job of rearing children is a complex and important business, perhaps the most important business we have before us today, and we have not put our minds to it. Parents, by and large, are unskilled laborers, working at the most highly diversified job there is—that of bringing up children. What grandparents learned about child rearing, on a trial and error basis, and passed on to today's parents, is almost obsolete in this highly mechanized, fast-moving, industrialized civilization. Today's parents have to grapple with the impact of hydrogen bombs, television, the radio, the automobile, the motion picture, on family life, as well as the high cost of living, overcrowded homes, communities unplanned for children, and a whole network of family and individual relationships which often conflict.

Small wonder then that the problems of children are increasing, that the healthy, confident, forthright child is in jeopardy. Our mental institutions are jammed with people who have not learned how to live in this modern world. Broken homes, latchkey children, city streets used for playgrounds, juvenile delinquency, jails used for detention homes, separation from parents . . . what causes these failures? What goes into the making of a well-balanced, healthy adult? What do parents want their children to be?

There are perhaps no more important questions to answer than these in today's world. Slowly we, as so-called grownups and mature people, have had it thrust upon us that the world of today is not the kind of world we thought that it was going to be when we grew up. We must be wise enough to admit that we ourselves were not prepared for a world in which the conditions of living—physical and emotional—would change at so great a rate. Children are growing up today in a world of miracles discovered in the physical sciences. Their home life is embellished, for good or evil, with fascinating trinkets of applied mechanics. Yesterday Johnny had the joy of helping squeeze a lovely round orange ball to get his morning juice. Today it all comes out of another can. And remember that this world of physical miracles to which children are born today places as much emphasis on how science kills as on how it saves. We who are grownups are bewitched by this, too. Like our children who have had no chance to know better, we stand in awe of man's glorious adventure into the mysteries of time and space. But somehow we are failing to speak out in protest that this is not enough. How human

beings can get along with themselves and with one another in this modern world of drastic technological changes that influence every aspect of our lives is the chief discovery which our generation must make. We must find ways to help our children grow to a maturity of mind if they are going to survive in the kind of world that seems just around the corner. How shall we give our children wisdom of the heart, without which the brilliance of the mind will betray their generation to almost inevitable destruction?

These are large and probing questions and I don't pretend to know the answers to them at all. But I do know that we are a long way from having all the facts we need to know about the way normal children mature emotionally, physically and socially, and about the way we can build well-being in children. I know, too, that our ignorance is costing us dearly. Already I understand there are more patients in mental institutions than there are in hospitals caring for the physically sick. Research must uncover not only why we have so many mental illnesses but give us guidance to more abundant living for us all. The feeling of helplessness, of not knowing what to do next, or even of not caring, is indicative of a kind of immaturity and lack of knowledge and wisdom that seems to make it difficult for us as adults to know how to cope with our problems today. How much more will continued ignorance add to the burden of the next generation?

This is a pessimistic picture but I don't believe that it needs to be so. We in America have had a great genius for getting things done when we make our minds up to do them. We have a technique in which voluntary enterprise and government join hands. We have an age-old tradition of helping ourselves and helping one another. We have a population in which all the races and cultures of the world are represented. So we can draw on the most diverse variety of talents that any nation has ever been able to call upon. With these tools we can go forward in improving the state of our nation's children.

We need funds—both private funds and government funds—to bring to all children the best that modern science and education have to offer. We need more persons—fathers, mothers, teachers, social workers, doctors, nurses—who know and care and can put into practice what is known about child-rearing today. We also need greatly expanded research programs to give the answers to our unsolved questions.

A Challenge

We have, in this year of 1950, an unusual opportunity to focus public attention on children's needs.

Another White House Conference for children is upon us. Each of the four conferences that have been held during this century has made an important contribution to the lives of children and the well-being of the nation. These conferences represent the best American tradition—that of bringing together citizens of many interests, public and private agencies, and experts and consumers of expert knowledge. And this time the conference is focusing on this most important problem of our time—that of

"how we can develop in children the mental, emotional, and spiritual qualities essential to individual happiness and to responsible citizenship."

Here is a real challenge for us all. The conference plans and program are in the end the responsibility of 52 private citizens who constitute the national committee. But almost all the states and territories have their own White House Conference Committees. Some of these state committees have organized local committees and all are studying the facts and planning for action in their own communities. There is a National Advisory Council of all the national organizations. There are committees of experts reviewing scientific knowledge. There are committees working on that important problem of communicating what is known and what the conference may bring forth.

The strength of this conference will come, not merely from the 4 or 5 day meeting in December, but *from the sum total of effort of citizens everywhere, working individually and in groups, both in preparation for the December meeting and in the follow-through afterward.*

One of our more cynical reporters in Washington, some weeks ago, cornered Dr. Leonard Mayo, after a meeting of the National Committee for the Conference.

"Now, honestly, Dr. Mayo," she said, "what can just a lot more talk do for children?"

Considerately and wisely, Dr. Mayo answered:

"I don't suppose anyone has counted all the words of talk that went on before the Allied expenditure to take the beachheads at Normandy, but I am sure the two years of it that preceded that daring adventure had a lot to do with its success."

Mobilizing peacetime forces to take the beachheads of emotional, social, and spiritual poverty and poor health in children is an even more difficult enterprise. But I am confident this Midcentury White House Conference and all the preparatory work that is done for it can help us mightily toward achieving that objective, provided all of us pitch in and help.

From its first stages to its last, this conference belongs to the people of the United States. It will be as dynamic as you, and I, and everyone else like us, choose to make it.

In conclusion, I venture to make a generalization that I doubt you will challenge. It is this:

The extent to which a nation understands and meets the needs of its children is one of the best tests civilization has of its maturity and worth.

Children in the United States are more fortunate in many ways than the children of many other lands. But *I don't think any one of us would like to have our kind of society judged by what we are now doing for and to some of our children.*

In humility of spirit, then, but in unbreakable

faith in our capacity for greater achievement, let us resolve to make this a nation where *all* children know they are loved and cherished, where all children respect others because they themselves are respected, where all, within their abilities, contribute creatively and generously because they are given every encouragement to do so, and where all of them display the common moralities of honesty, loyalty, kindness and social responsibility because they see these common moralities demonstrated in their elders day by day.

RESEARCH STUDY IN AN ADOPTION PROGRAM*

Hazel S. Morrison

General Secretary

Boston Children's Friend Society

Boston, Massachusetts

FORMERLY our agency did little adoption work. Within the past two years the agency has become almost exclusively an adoption agency. In order to aid us in making these adoptions more successful, a follow-up study of the children we had placed in adoption some ten to twenty years ago was undertaken. It may be stated at the outset that our procedure in adoption involves helping the natural parents, usually the mother, in releasing the baby for adoption, ascertaining the suitability of the baby for adoption, including medical and mental testing, studying the adoptive couple, matching racial background, appearance and potentialities of the child to the background, appearance and capacities of the adoptive parents. A year's supervision is given to the child in the adoption home by the agency to make certain of the adjustment of parents and child before legal adoption takes place. During the course of the supervisory period certain constantly recurring questions confronted both workers and parents. The staff of the agency has felt that the year's period of supervision in the adoption home could be made more useful to the adoptive parents by discussing with them some of the problems that they would be encountering in the years ahead. It was believed that if some of these problems could be anticipated much of the anxiety surrounding them could be relieved and the good adjustment of parents and child furthered. Adoptive parents too were asking for help with such questions

as: What age shall I tell my child he is adopted? Should I wait until he asks? Should I begin as speaking of him as my adopted son? Will he ask about his natural parents? At what age? Will he ask why his mother did not keep him? Shall I refer him to the agency? Shall I show him the agency summary of his background? How shall I answer questions of friends and relatives about his background? Will playmates ask him about this? How can I help him answer them? Shall I tell the school when he enters? Shall I tell the neighbors when we move to a new neighborhood? Shall I tell the name of the agency?

As an aid in helping with answers to some of these questions, a group meeting was held at the agency to which a limited number of adoptive parents was invited who had agency children in their homes pending legal adoption. The response confirmed our belief that the adoptive parents were eager for help. Following the meeting, the staff felt that if we had knowledge of the problems of adjustment of the children placed by the agency in the past this would be of real value in advising our present adoptive parents. It is on the results of such a follow-up study that we wish to report.

Mrs. Georgina Hotchkiss, a former staff member, agreed to undertake such a follow-up, making this her thesis for an advanced degree at the Simmons College School of Social Work and consequently carrying the chief responsibility for interviewing the adoptive parents and organizing the data. (Four interviews with adoptive parents were by the executive secre-

* Presented at League's program, National Conference of Social Work, Atlantic City, 1950.

tary.) The staff participated at the outset in focusing the study and met from time to time during the course of the study as well as at the completion of it.

It was decided to contact the adopting parents of the children placed for adoption by the agency from January 1932 to October 1939 inclusive, and to obtain their analysis of the factors affecting the adjustment of their children. While there were a great many questions we should have liked to include in the range of our investigations, it seemed wise to focus our study on the parents' analysis of the difficulties they found in adjustment. An effort was to be made to get information on such specific factors as adjustment in relation to the age of placement, to academic achievement, to appearance of the child and background information, including the explanation of adoption to the child, as well as to the attitude of the family, friends and community toward the adopted child. Thirty children had been placed by the agency during this period but as two of these adoptions had been foster homes that became adoption homes they were eliminated from the study as atypical. Twenty-eight letters were sent out to these parents by the executive, stating that the adoption program of the agency was increasing, that ideas and experiences of the parents of the children placed some years ago would be helpful in making wise placements as well as in giving sound advice to new parents. The letter asked if they would be willing to talk to the worker, a former staff member, and it stated that the children need not be included in the discussion and that we would be glad to follow any suggestions that they might wish as an explanation of the visit. Of the twenty-eight letters sent out, six were returned—address unknown—leaving twenty-two who received the letter. Of the twenty adoptive parents who responded, interviews were arranged with sixteen. In addition, questionnaires were sent to two others who could not be interviewed because of distance (west of the Rockies). The questionnaire covered material similar to that covered in the interview. The parents were seen in sixteen cases and the children were seen briefly in ten. Two could not be interviewed within the time limit of the study. The focus of the study was to be the difficulties the adoptive parents saw in the adjustment of the children and was to be a study based on their judgments which, after all, was our main concern because it was the parents' problems as they found them that we wished to resolve.

General Adjustment of the Children

Since the focus was on the parents' opinion of the adjustment of the children, no data were obtained on the present social, marital, health or economic status

of the adoptive parents except as it was volunteered or observed by surroundings. The study revealed that the adoptive parents were an unusually stable group. All were employed and usually in the same type of work as at the time of placement of the children. All had the same or better economic status. There were no divorces. Two of the adoptive mothers had died, one father had remarried and the stepmother was particularly devoted to her adopted daughter. The other death was recent and there has been no remarriage. Parents were comparatively young, none over forty years of age at the time the children were taken. Of the thirty-six adoptive parents (eighteen sets of parents) six individuals at the time of placement were under thirty years of age, six were thirty to thirty-five years and fifteen were thirty-five to forty years of age. The ages of nine were unknown. These eighteen sets of parents had a total of thirty-three children—twenty-four adopted through this agency and five through other sources—four had natural children. The ages of the agency children at the time of the study ranged from eight to twenty-two years. As to the number of children in the families:

- 8 had 1 child
- 7 had 2 children
- 1 had 3 children
- 2 had 4 children

The twenty-four study children were equally divided—twelve boys and twelve girls. All the children but one had been of illegitimate birth. All the children were healthy and with no physical abnormalities at the time of placement. The children's health was not considered by the adoptive parents an important factor in adjustment but two children had met with serious health problems. One of these had contracted TB following her marriage at the age of twenty-one, and one had had an intermittent undiagnosed illness since she was five years of age. She is now eleven years. The parents felt that eighteen out of twenty-four children were getting along satisfactorily. They had had problems but had worked them through or were confident that they would. (The eight families that had only one child were in this group.) But the parents of six of the twenty-four children were dissatisfied with the adjustment the children had made and had doubts that the ultimate adjustment would be successful. Problems of enuresis, temper tantrums, school problems and hostility toward the parents were current at the time of the study. There was no delinquency reported nor any indication that the child's relationship to the community was not good. Actually it appeared that the prognosis of only one child could be considered poor. This boy is now seventeen years.

Age at Placement

Eighteen years ago, when these children were first being placed, the agency considered nine months the earliest age for safe placement so the ages of the children ranged from at least nine months to six years.

AGES OF THE CHILDREN AT PLACEMENT

Age	Number of Children
7 months.....	1
9 months to 1 year.....	6
1 to 2.....	8
2 to 3.....	5
3 to 4.....	2
4 to 5.....	0
5 to 6.....	2
	<hr/> 24

Of the twenty-four children in the study, the parents of five felt age was a factor in the adjustment of the child. Those children placed at one year represented fairly clear-cut adoption planning and they presented no medical or psychological problem and a minimum of vacillating by the parents as to the decision for adoption. Those placed between one and two years represented problems, either delay of decision by the mother or medical conditions. Placements at over two years represented referrals from other agencies, long-time boarding care or those who had been with their own family and then later released for adoption. In considering the parents' analysis of age of placement as a factor in the adjustment of the child, we must give some consideration to the influence of the agency's thinking at the time. The opinion of the agency that placement earlier than nine months was not safe probably lessened the number who felt age was a factor. Actually, in discussing this in interviews the parents indicated that what was important was not particularly the age but what had gone on before in the foster home—a child who had been in a number of foster homes was usually quite upset the first few weeks in the adoption home. On the other hand, a child placed at eleven months who had been in one foster home for nine months with a possessive foster mother who resented his placement in a home not her own, presented problems of adjustment in the adoption home. This adoptive mother remembered keenly the first three weeks this youngster was in her home, as he cried constantly and refused to be comforted. As his adoptive mother said, "He gave me no chance to become attached to him." He is now ten years of age, is nervous and high-strung, stutters and was enuretic until school age. He is of the group not adjusting satisfactorily.

Educational Achievement

For the purpose of analyzing the parents' evaluation of educational adjustment of the children, for

comparative purposes, they have been divided into two groups: Group I including those whose adoptive parents had less than high school graduation up to one year's training beyond high school; Group II including those whose parents, at least one of whom, had completed a college education (college or some education beyond high school to be considered the normal expectation for the children in this group). All the children in both groups received an average rating or above in psychological tests with one exception, a child placed too early for testing. In evaluating the child's educational potentialities, both psychological testing and the achievements of the natural parents were taken into consideration.

There were 9 parents in Group I with 10 of the study children.

There were 9 parents in Group II with 14 of the study children.

There were more parents in Group II who spoke of the educational difficulties of their children than Group I, more failing in their grades than in Group I. No prediction of these failures could be made from the preplacement psychological tests. The parents' emphasis on achievement for the child was apparent in varying degrees in both groups. It was seen when the child's school work was a problem and where the child was reported to be doing well in school. The interviewer reported that pressure on the child was evidenced in five situations. Of the ten children in Group I, eight were considered by the parents to be doing average or better, two were not doing average work up to grade, one because of ill health, the other because of a reading disability. The parents in these two cases showed no pressure for the children to achieve scholastically. However, two families where the children were doing well in school evidenced pressure. One boy in the 6th grade with a B average had parents aware of his very superior intelligence rating at placement and felt he was not doing his best. The mother expressed the need for an adopted child to do better than an own one "because the yardstick used in measuring the adopted child is a longer one." The other child was an eleven-year-old boy on the honor roll in the seventh grade. This mother knew her son had done well with intelligence tests as a baby and was sure he would do better now. She admitted that she was anxious that he excel in music, although he had no interest or ability in this, and he was studying two instruments and there was preparation for him to take voice lessons. No parent in Group I felt education had been any problem in adjustment.

Of the fourteen children in Group II, nine were reported to be doing average or above work in school

(Continued on page 12)

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

John M. Glenn*

I WAS asked to offer a resolution, which would express the feelings of all of us, on learning of the death of John M. Glenn, formerly the Director General of the Russell Sage Foundation.

I am one of two living members of the committee of five or six who met together at a National Conference in Baltimore in 1915 and started an organization which grew eventually into the Child Welfare League of America—the other member being Wilfred Reynolds of Chicago. We were motivated by our very practical knowledge of a need and by the recommendation of the first White House Conference. We were without funds and it was John M. Glenn and Hastings Hart who made it possible for us to begin some operative service. We were allowed to use the office and the personnel of the Child-Caring Division of the Foundation for the recruiting of members and the interchange of information throughout our growing membership. When we reached the point where we had a larger membership and a better understanding and definition of the service the member agencies needed, and were able to employ Carl Carstens as the Director and to establish an individual office, it was the Russell Sage Foundation which offered us office space in their building and made definite financial contributions, which continued for many years.

When one becomes an elder statesman, he comes to these National Conferences with mingled feelings. Even at this present Conference, I have found myself looking about corridors and rooms to discover whether I might see Carl Carstens, or Henry Thurston, or Grace Abbott. I have found myself wondering whether Mary Irene is present or whether Jacob Kepcs is coming; or whether I might be so fortunate as to have a chat with Prentice Murphy. Many others there are for whose pleasant smiles I continue searching, and find them not. Now I shall be looking about for John M. Glenn.

We mourn his leaving but at the same time, at this very moment, I think of him with a sense of triumph, and I know that he would not wish me to make this moment one of gloom or despair. He, with others I have named, so lived and so worked that their lives continue to be with all of us who knew them. Mr. Glenn was a man of great deeds and of modest and lovable personality. I would that there were time to dwell upon some of the personal incidents which crowd my mind. He was the head of a great under-

taking, with millions of dollars at stake, yet he was as plain and modest in his daily living and work as anyone among us.

I recall an incident which illustrates what I mean. Some of us farmer boys who come to this Conference were not brought up on four-dollar dinners. I arrived at a Conference in this very city with some perturbations as to the high cost of living. At noontime, I thought I might slip away from the throng and find a back street commissary which would be within my modest means. I was a little hesitant, thinking that some of the high-standing delegates might see me, so kept watch as I searched. At last, a modest place was found, and looking up and down the street and seeing no one, I stepped within and soon ordered my thirty-five cent lunch. Looking about the little room, imagine my surprise to find at an adjoining table no one less than John M. Glenn, the Director of the Russell Sage Foundation of New York.

One night in San Francisco, to my surprise I found myself elected President of this august League. I was puzzled as to how that had happened but I soon learned that the League was in severe financial circumstances and that also it was being attacked through the press of New York City by a disgruntled, discharged employee. Henry Thurston helped me handle the New York press. Paul Beisser promised to continue to help fight the financial battle. One hot midsummer day I was called to New York to learn that funds were so low that the secretaries could not have their pay, so that some of them might go on vacation. The Director of the League was nervous, of course, but seemed greatly relieved when I suggested that I might call on Mr. Glenn. I went downstairs to his office with some trepidation. As I approached his office I suddenly realized that a rather small chap was going into the office of a top man of a great organization and that I had better try, at least, to assume some of the dignities appropriate for the occasion. I hunted for a personal card, which I sent into the Director's office. In a moment I heard laughter, then someone saying, "Come in here—come in here. What is all this card ceremony—is this Bostonese?" He was most cordial; invited me to sit down with him in an informal way, in a little back room, which happened at the moment to contain packing cases. He asked me if I knew a good story. We exchanged stories for a while, then he suddenly asked, "What was it you wanted?" I said, "Money," and he replied, "I supposed so." I explained the situation. "Well, I approve of Carstens, and I approve of the League," he said, "and I will send a check by this afternoon." I had gotten the money but I had gotten something else, which will stay with me forever: the sense of the comradeship of a great man.

* Presented at annual meeting of Child Welfare League of America, Atlantic City, New Jersey, April 25, 1950.

I offered and moved for adoption, the following resolution with the recommendation that it be recorded in the permanent records of the League, that a copy be sent to the Russell Sage Foundation and to any member of Mr. Glenn's family, and that the adoption vote be expressed by standing silently:

Whereas, John M. Glenn, late General Director of the Russell Sage Foundation, was often thought of as the Child Welfare League's godfather, was among the pioneers who saw the need for extended development of more adequate services to the children of America, and in 1908 established in the Foundation the Department of Child-Helping, in which Department the League began its work and was given office quarters and service in the Foundation Building for many years without charge; and

Whereas, For more than twenty-five years, mostly under Mr. Glenn's administration, the Foundation made annual appropriations to the League budget, and throughout all these years Mr. Glenn continued in many practical ways expressing his special interest in the League's role in improving the standards of Public and Private service to children throughout our land and kept himself informed of the League's major projects, and continued giving freely of his able counsel;

BE IT RESOLVED, That at this annual meeting of the League we record in our permanent records that we learned of his death, on April 20, in his ninety-second year, with profound sorrow and a great sense of loss; but also with a deep sense of victory and with lasting respect and affection for the memory of a great and serviceable life, lived with modesty and kindness and continuing rich in benefits to the children of America. For thousands of his fellow citizens life is better because we have had John M. Glenn's comradeship along "Man's Rough Road."

And it was adopted.

CHENEY C. JONES,
*Superintendent, The New England Home for
Little Wanderers, Boston*

DAY CARE

BY now our agencies have received a copy of the "Preliminary Report of the Function and Practice of Child Welfare: A Definition." The nature of this service to children is being explored through discussion at regional conferences. The confusion as to the function of day-care programs that has arisen because of the variety of names and auspices under which such programs are carried on can be relieved by intensive discussion. There is general agreement that accepted standards of care must prevail under whatever auspices or name, and that the program reflect the purpose of the agency. This is certain: that there should be a sufficiently broad program of children's services in each community to insure that each child will receive care in accordance with its needs. Child-care centers, nursery schools and foster family day-care services are essential in such a community plan.

Day care, under whatever name, is considered to be a supplement to family living. The child's ability to be helped through participation in a day-care program would depend on his family's ability to use this service constructively.

In order to complete the Definition of Day Care, answers to many of the following questions are needed:

What is "care"? Can it be called day care if it is for one day a week, or two hours per day?

How do you decide whom to admit when there is a long waiting list?

How do you decide which children can use the group day-care program? Which children will be helped by foster family day care and which children need some other service?

How do you make the program flexible enough to meet the variety of needs that children bring to the day-care agency?

Do you control intake in order to preserve the basic values of a group-care program?

Where do you find help for children who do not fit into group day care, or foster family day care?

What does day care offer to the child? What does it mean to a child to have "two parents"?

Are there points at which the social need of the child is at variance with his educational need?

Can we jeopardize the child's growth because the mother needs to work?

Does the child change in the nature of his problems and his ability to live in a group after he has become a part of the group?

Do children sometimes need "vacations" from nursery school? How can the caseworker help in planning with the parent for this?

Is there any valid purpose within the community for commercial day-care programs? Do these programs sometimes take on the community conscience? Should licensing authorities work toward strengthening these resources?

How can the knowledge and skills of the parent, the caseworker, the teacher and the doctor be most effectively combined?

This discussion can be continued through the Day Care column in CHILD WELFARE with the benefits of the thinking of the entire field. Pertinent articles from readers which could be published in CHILD WELFARE can make an important contribution to this Definition.

DOROTHY H. BEERS

RESEARCH STUDY IN AN ADOPTION PROGRAM

(Continued from page 9)

or college. Four children were failing in most of their subjects in their grade. Information about the fourteenth child in Group II is not available. Two of the children, reported average in grades, were considered educational problems by their parents. Thus six were considered to have presented educational difficulties, these six representing four families. Parents in three of these families felt that the children's difficulties in school had contributed to difficulties in general adjustment. These three children represented three of the six children discussed under general adjustment whose parents felt they might not turn out all right. The psychologist who tested these three children presenting educational problems reported they were of normal intelligence or above.

The psychological picture given of the child at the time of placement may have played a part here as achievement for the child was determined in the parents' minds by this report. While some indicated that it would be up to the child to decide whether he wanted education beyond high school, it is evident that parents hoped to influence the child to go and were disappointed when this appeared unlikely. It had been the agency's practice in the early placements to give a detailed psychological report; sometimes the I.Q. had actually been given. One child placed with an I.Q. rating "low normal" and with retarded speech had been accepted by a couple with the understanding that high school completion might not be possible, but learned when the youngster was about three years of age that the speech retardation could be helped by special speech training. This youngster had gone weekly for speech training at a child guidance clinic and the psychological test done here when her speech had been corrected had given her a high I.Q. She had been used as a demonstration for medical students to indicate changing I.Q. through the correction of a speech difficulty. This later I.Q. was the standard by which the child's performance was measured in school by the parents. She is one of the six in the problem group. Her present I.Q. is 104.

It is possible that educational pressure is a characteristic of the present generation of parents and is not emphasized with the group of adoptive parents more than with groups of natural parents. The present tendency to hold parents responsible for the inadequacy of their children may be a contributing factor and also it may be that the adoptive parent feels he is held more responsible because he voluntarily sought the burden of parenthood. The study reveals that parents felt they were not being good

parents unless they helped the child to develop his greatest educational potentialities.

The agency tries to match complexion, hair and eye color, stature, etc., in an endeavor to have the child as nearly as possible resemble the adoptive parents. Of the children seen in the interviews there appeared little physical resemblance to the adoptive parents. Nevertheless, all the parents interviewed mentioned that friends had commented on similarity of appearance. This appeared to be a source of satisfaction to both parents and child. It may be that friends felt that such comment would be pleasing to the parents.

Those who commented on family and community attitudes felt that the children had been well accepted, some indicating that they felt the adopted children were favorites with the relatives over own children. They felt also that in school and in church there had been no discrimination shown but this was one of the topics which was not particularly productive in evoking comment.

Background Information

The agency at the time these children were placed believed that all adopted children should know of their adoption and at as early an age as possible. It believed that the child would from time to time ask questions re. his natural parents and background if he felt free to do so and that these questions should be answered truthfully and appropriately for his age. In most cases a background summary had been given the adoptive parents. All the children with one exception had been told early of their adoption, between the ages of two and four years. The two children placed at six years were, of course, aware of it and took part in the selection of their adoption home. The stories told of the adoption were of the father and mother seeking a baby, choosing him, and details were given of his clothes, toys and his homecoming. This story seemed to take its place with the other nursery stories and had to be repeated without omission of any details. All of the parents except one believed that they had succeeded in presenting an understandable, acceptable story of adoption to their children. They felt this early story had been accepted and enjoyed by the children and did not feel it had been anything but a constructive experience for the child and a positive factor in parent and child relationship.

In telling the child of his adoption the word *chosen* had often been used and seemed to the parents a more acceptable word. One mother could never use the word *adopted*—said I chose you, when I got you, etc., but this youngster talks quite freely of adopted

children. Another mother who took her little girl when she was three and one half years used *adopted* as a term of endearment, a suggestion made by social workers and often mentioned in the literature. When putting her child to bed at night she would kiss her and say, "Good night my dear little adopted daughter." After a short time the child said, "I don't want to be your 'dopted daughter—just your little girl." Two of the families used special adoption parties on the anniversary of the children's coming to them. These were discontinued when the children were about twelve years as the children did not want to seem special and different from their friends.

In contrast to this, there was only one set of parents who felt comfortable and satisfied with the way in which they had handled or hoped to handle background information, including illegitimacy. The one exception felt that the experience of telling her son had been extremely difficult but successful from the point of view of adjustment and relationship.

The parents in this study who could not accept the agency's point of view in telling the child of his background if he asks, including illegitimacy, had three questions that gave them grave concern:

1. Will the information arouse the child's interest in his natural parents so that he will try to locate them?
2. Will knowledge of his illegitimacy affect his moral standards?
3. Will it make him feel less their child?

The amount of background material the parents had given their children differed greatly as well as the kind of information and the accuracy.

PARENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARD TELLING CHILD OF NATURAL BACKGROUND

<i>Attitude</i>	<i>Number of Parents</i>
Have given (or plan to give) full facts as known, including illegitimacy	6
Have given (or plan to give) facts, without illegitimacy	1
Have given incomplete or false facts	3
Undecided	3
Plan to give no facts	4
Not classified	1
TOTAL	18

One illustration must suffice to show some of the dangers in giving this information.

Mrs. Jordan has three adopted children, the youngest of whom was adopted through this agency. She and Mr. Jordan agreed that the children should know the full story of their background when they were twenty-one. They felt that the children would have

guessed the fact of their illegitimate birth and for this reason felt that no attempt should be made to hide this from them. Only one of the three has been told the facts as yet. This daughter, Mary, had been a gentle, amenable, affectionate girl and her parents were devoted to her. At nineteen she became engaged to a boy and her parents became somewhat concerned because of their youth and because they were moving in a crowd of young people who did considerable drinking. Mary's natural mother, Mrs. Jordan knew, had become pregnant while under the influence of liquor and she felt that Mary should have some warning of the dangers of her present habits. She told Mary about her mother at this time. Mary seemed completely surprised and considerably upset by the knowledge of her illegitimacy and Mrs. Jordan asked her if she had not already guessed this. Mary's answer was, "I always thought that I was probably the thirteenth child of a very poor family." She broke her engagement. Mrs. Jordan has not had time since to analyze, to her own satisfaction, whether she did right or wrong in giving Mary this information, nor does she yet know whether it will change her plans about telling the other two children when they are older.

Parents in the study who have told their children of their illegitimacy stressed that this knowledge comes as a shock. None of these children had asked if he were illegitimate. None of the parents indicated that they regarded their child's ignorance of his natural background as in any way creating problems in his adjustment or relationship to them.

Of the four who were given sufficient background information so that their natural families might have been looked up, none has done so, at least so far as the adoptive parents know. It must be remembered however that none of these children had asked for this information. Although no deduction can be made from so small a number of cases, it suggests that the widespread fear of adoptive parents that children will search for their natural parents if identifying background information is given them is unfounded.

From the foregoing, the agency believes that:

1. Young, flexible, stimulating but not demanding couples make the most desirable adoptive parents.
2. Early placement of babies, preferably four to six months of age is desirable in terms of the child's later adjustment.
3. The psychological report of the infants at six months or under can give reasonable assurance only that the child is developing normally at that time and therefore the adoptive parents can be told only that the child's intelligence is within normal limits.
4. It is wise to stress the importance of the early supervisory visits in the adoption home as the agency has been doing in the past few years.
5. The avenue of approach to the adoption agency should be left open so that adoptive parents can return for suggestions and the agency should be willing to see the child who desires further background information.
6. There is need for further study of what and how background information should be given so that this can be a strengthening force to the child and to the parent-child relationship.

THE 1950 CASE RECORD EXHIBIT

The 1950 Child Welfare League Case Record Exhibit had its first showing at National Conference in Atlantic City. Great interest was evinced and many records were read.

The 106 records in the exhibit were submitted by 67 agencies from 30 states. Every year sees an increase in the number of agencies whose records are selected. The records were chosen by the twelve regional committees. Again, with real conviction, the regional chairmen emphasized the value of participation in the selection of records. Because of agencies' increasing interest and feeling of responsibility, we believe that the records in the exhibit are truly representative of the best which the agencies have produced. Reports from the regional committees have pointed up much more that the agencies consider participation in the exhibit a year-round process and have utilized the process for staff development and improving standards of performance. It is interesting that the stimulation given to staff by working on the exhibit has convinced one worker to go on with professional training. One agency is reviewing its medical procedure because of the questions raised about one of its records. In another agency the staff is writing evaluations of its own records before the records are submitted to the regional committee.

As more and more people have become actively engaged in the work of the committees, many suggestions and constant re-evaluation of the functioning of the committees and the use of the criteria have been made. All the reports demonstrate the thought given to bettering the quality of the exhibit. The recommendations for facilitating the work of the committees have been extremely helpful.

This year, as last, committee members traveled great distances in order to be present at the committee meeting when plans and selections were made. This in itself demonstrates the meaning the exhibit has for those of us working in the child welfare field.

This year the Child Welfare League of America presents the tenth case record exhibit. It is interesting to trace changing concerns through the types of records submitted. Although there are many records on work with adolescents, the focus this year is on work with the preschool child, especially in the adoption area. Adoption records have increased to twenty-two. These records are concerned for the most part with the placement for adoption of the child from the ages of two to eight years. In addition to records illustrating preparation of the child for the placement, there are also records showing casework service to adopting parents. The records illustrating work with children in foster home care demonstrate

all phases of the placement process, with particular stress on preparation of the child and parents. Several records illustrate preparation of foster parents for a particular child. We find too an increase in the Protective Services section with casework help given to parents in order to help maintain the family rather than placement of the children. In general the exhibit shows in each area of service a weighting of records showing the preparation for service. The focus is on the child and his parents, with awareness of the rights of natural parents.

The breakdown of the exhibit in sections is as follows:

Adoption.....	22 records
Day Nursery Care.....	4 records
Foster Home Care.....	27 records
Adoption Home Studies.....	9 records
Boarding Home Studies.....	9 records
Institutional Care.....	12 records
Casework with children in their own homes....	8 records
Protective Services.....	7 records
Unmarried Parents.....	8 records

The 1950 exhibit is rich in interesting and helpful material. As we look at this tenth exhibit, we have no question about the increasing skill and better standards of performance in services for children and their parents throughout the country. In the fall records will be selected for the permanent library and some will be added to the list of records mimeographed for teaching.

The 1950 exhibit is now available on loan to League member agencies free, except for the cost of expressage; and to nonmembers at a fee of \$25.00 for three weeks, plus expressage.

HARRIET D. ZIEGLER,

*National Chairman 1950 Case Record Exhibit Committee
Supervisor, Children's Center, New Haven, Conn.*

Grace McGowan Retires

As of January, 1950, Grace McGowan retired from active professional duties as Executive Secretary of the Catholic Community League of Canton, Ohio.

Miss McGowan is known to the Child Welfare League member agencies, for she has served as League Board member from 1935-1941, and has given consultation service under League auspices.

Canton, her home town, will particularly benefit by her new freedom to give more of her time to the responsibilities carried by an active informed layman, with conviction about the importance of social service.

We wish her a long and useful service in her new role.

THE 1951 CASE RECORD EXHIBIT

It gives us great pleasure to announce the appointment of Miss Flora Miller, Supervisor, Division of Child Welfare, Monroe County Department of Social Welfare, Rochester, New York, as National Chairman of the 1951 Case Record Exhibit Committee. The Committee held its first planning meeting in Chicago on June 6th. A detailed report of this meeting will appear in the October issue of *CHILD WELFARE*.

The regional chairmen are listed below:

- AREA I.** Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi
Miss Louise Pittman
Bureau of Child Welfare
Department of Public Welfare
421 S. Union Street
Montgomery, Alabama
- AREA II.** Maryland, Washington, D. C., Virginia
Miss Eleanor Welborn
Family and Children's Society
204 W. Lanvale Street
Baltimore 17, Maryland
- AREA III.** Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut
Miss Marjorie Foulke
Vermont Children's Aid Society
Burlington, Vermont
- AREA IV.** Illinois, Missouri, Indiana, Michigan
Miss Lela Carr
Department of Public Welfare
Springfield, Illinois
- AREA V.** Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas
Mrs. Isabel Buck
Colorado Children's Aid Society
314 - 14th Street
Denver, Colorado
- AREA VI.** Greater New York, Westchester County, New Jersey
Mrs. Wilma Miller
Spence-Chapin Adoption Service
304 E. 33rd Street
New York City
- AREA VII.** Albany, Syracuse, Buffalo, Elmira, Niagara Falls, Rochester
Mrs. Dorothy Washburn
Children's Aid and S.P.C.C.
330 Delaware Avenue
Buffalo 2, New York
- AREA VIII.** Ohio, Kentucky
Miss Ruth Heistand
Children's Bureau of Dayton
225 N. Jefferson Street
Dayton 2, Ohio
- AREA IX.** Delaware, Pennsylvania
Miss Margaret Rehrig
Children's Bureau of Delaware
1310 Delaware Avenue
Wilmington, Delaware

AREA X. North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee
Mrs. Myra Mitchiner
Division of Child Welfare
North Carolina Dept. of Public Welfare
Raleigh, N. C.

AREA XI. California, Hawaii, Washington, Oregon, Idaho
Miss Barbara Hansen
Children's Bureau of Los Angeles
2824 Hyans Street
Los Angeles 26, California

AREA XII. Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin
Mr. David L. Levine
Jewish Family and Children's Service
404 S. 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota

READERS' FORUM

Letters commenting on the "Statement of Principles and Policies on Public Child Welfare" continue to come to the Child Welfare League of America. A few additional ones are here presented.*

**By Richardson L. Rice, Executive Director
Child and Family Service, Syracuse, New York**

Though I realize these comments regarding the "Statement of Principles and Policies on Public Child Welfare" are later than you had hoped, I send them along for what they are worth. As I mentioned to you at the Conference, I circulated them among the Council staff, a Board member and a professional representative who happens to be a Catholic and also the Director of the Children's Division at the Department of Public Welfare. Without attempting to give individual reports, I can say that no one had any major criticism to make. A comment made by a Council staff member was seconded by several others. He said that reading the papers left one with the feeling that they were patterned rather directly after the situation as we now have it here in Syracuse. Needless to say we are pleased with our relationship in the public field and, though we recognize areas for clarification, we feel it very well meets the principles and policies as set forth.

**By Beatrice E. Gaughan, General Case Supervisor
Division of Child Welfare
Monroe County Department of Public Welfare
Rochester, New York**

We received the "Statement of Principles and Policies on Public Child Welfare" which you mailed to us in March and have been slow in answering your letter because I wished to make sure that each of my supervisors studied it and thought it through.

* The Statement of Principles and Policies on Public Child Welfare appeared in the May issue with an editorial by Leonard W. Mayo, and some Comments. Further discussion appeared in the June issue.

In general we all felt it to be a very sound statement. Point number 17 on page 5 did make almost all of us react "Why say this to Public Departments! Isn't it just as important for private agencies to recognize this?" But we quickly agreed that we were being unnecessarily defensive. It is true that in this community in years past, the public child welfare agency took leadership in preventing hasty and unnecessary placements of children, through its Children's Committee. However, as private agencies have been able to build up trained staffs, we no longer receive the type of referral that used to fill us with concern. We realize too that your statement must cover all areas of the country where the public agency workers in many instances may be geared only for work with the child in his own home.

As we studied the statement point by point, we found that it covered our present practice. We recognize special services that private agencies have to offer and extend public support orders to them whenever study reveals that a child has need of that service. Also, we extend public support to private agency cases when they have carried a case privately, established good working relationships with parents and children but where the parent can no longer support the placement financially.

In these cases we have carefully developed a procedure so that we do not interfere with the casework plan of the private agencies. Our greatest number of such cases locally is with the Rochester Catholic Charities. We work very closely together, feel we could not discharge our respective responsibilities without each other's services and use Father Ratigan, their Executive Director, as our consultant on religious problems of Roman Catholic children.

We regret that we have never had a local lay committee to advise with us as we feel such a plan would have value. We see this as something for the future.

I feel that the Committee is to be commended for drawing up so fine a statement. I suppose that even the finest policies can be poorly administered and that is what may cause issues. Those of us who comprise the Monroe County Child Welfare staff are trying to carry out the principles and policies outlined in the spirit in which we feel the Committee developed them.

By Mrs. William H. Resnick, *Chairman*
Foster Care Committee
The Family and Children's Center of
Stamford, Connecticut

The Family & Children's Center's foster care committee, which is completing a two year study of the general principles of foster care and the specific practices in that field of this agency, has spent its last

two meetings discussing your Statement of Principles and Policies on Public Child Welfare.

We feel that the Statement embodies basic and minimum concepts with which no group interested in the welfare of children could quarrel. We have only a few minor questions and suggestions:

No. 11. When you state, "in every local unit of public welfare service," do you mean, "in every local unit of direct public welfare service to children"? We feel this phrase needs clarification.

No. 20. We feel this statement is ambiguous because it does not make clear the exact legal and financial responsibility of a federal service in cases of nonsettlement.

No. 21. Do you mean that a unit should be established within the Federal Children's Bureau or that there should be a newly created unit, not part of the Department of Labor?

In addition, we feel that a further statement should be added, to the effect that public agencies should not duplicate the work of existing, qualified private agencies which are equipped to care for the needs of children in any given community.

Mr. Higgins, in the last issue of your *Journal*,* has answered Monsignor O'Grady far better than we could. We see no implications in your Statement that would mean the elimination of "practically all of the voluntary child welfare work of our country" nor do we believe that your plans will "greatly weaken the structure of juvenile courts as they have been developed in the United States." We see nothing in your Statement that "means fairly complete control by the national government over all individual and family life." Many of the policies you advocate are already in effect in the state of Connecticut, and our nonsectarian agency has found its work helped rather than hindered by such state requirements as exist here.

By Israel G. Jacobson, *Executive Director*
Association for Jewish Children of Philadelphia

The following is a letter sent to me by Mr. Laurence Brunswick, one of our Board Members who is a member of our Executive Committee and who is also President of the Board of the Neighborhood Center of Philadelphia. I think the letter will be of interest to you.

Dear Mr. Jacobson:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 8, 1950, enclosing Statement of Principles and Policies on Public Child Welfare, with copy of letter from the Child Welfare League of America, Inc. to the member agencies, and copy of letter from the National Conference of Catholic Charities.

I have reviewed the papers carefully and it is my opinion that the statement of the Child Welfare League of America of the

* CHILD WELFARE, May 1950, p. 14.

general concepts is fair and should be approved by the Association. While the trend is for a welfare state, the children who require assistance will benefit greatly under the Statement of Principles and Policies. I particularly note the statement in Item 18, wherein it is suggested that rates be paid commensurate with the quality of service rendered. We have tried to impress this principle on our local courts, with no avail.

The alarm in John O'Grady's letter seems unwarranted, as the statement provides for participation of private agencies and for the establishment of Boards as policy makers. The requirement that private charities shall be governed by the standards established by public welfare departments should not be objectionable to anyone.

Reply:

The following is a composite of some of the letters sent to agencies in reply to their comments and questions on the League's Statement. No one letter to the League raised all of the questions here indicated and no one reply commented on so many points of the League's Statement.

Letters received in response to our President's request for comments and criticisms of the Statement of Principles and Policies on Public Child Welfare have been routed to me for reply as the staff member working with the League's committee which drafted the Statement.

May I say first that we appreciate very much indeed your writing so fully and specifically your comments and those of several of your board and staff members. We are glad that you shared the Statement with them and secured their reactions. This is the type of consideration of the Statement for which we were hoping. I am sure that you will be interested in knowing a little more about the thinking of the League's committee on specific points during the process of developing the Statement.

In listing in the Foreword of the Statement some purposes, these were given only in terms of serving "as a guide." The committee did not consider that such a Statement of Principles and Policies on Public Child Welfare would in itself alone constitute "standards" for accrediting public agencies for League membership. The thinking was that, in general, the same standards for services to children in their own homes, in foster family homes, in day care, or in institutions, should apply whether the agency providing that service is administered under governmental or private auspices. The League's Statement of Principles and Policies on Public Child Welfare was directed primarily to agencies under public auspices which include in their program social service to children. In stating principles and policies for these public agencies, the aim of the League's committee was to make clear the public agency's responsibility, as for example in respect to community planning, purchase of care from private agencies, and other matters, and to state over-all principles and policies affecting philosophy, organization, administration,

et cetera, of public agencies. Private-agency responsibility, also over-all child welfare principles and policies, have been considered in the past in various League publications and conferences and may well need to be considered further.

We realize the difficulties in complete coverage, and possibly the wording of point 2 under General Concepts could be improved. I believe what the committee wanted to express was the existence of a final responsibility (in the last analysis) on the part of the government. For example, most people accept the concept that government has some such final responsibility in respect to education, though parents have a right, of course, to send children to private schools and private schools have a right to operate. If we think of government as the people, there would seem to be a responsibility to meet needs which transcends the budget allowances of a given public agency. In the second sentence of point 2, perhaps the word *government* rather than the words *governmental agencies* should have been used. I am sure the committee felt that public agencies have a responsibility to interpret to appropriating bodies the existence of unmet needs due to inadequate budget allowances. Of course more than adequate financing is involved in securing coverage, including the development of services (see last sentence of point 14) and the best utilization of personnel (see last sentence of point 11).

In respect to item 3, there are very many rural communities and whole counties in this country where there is no social planning body under private auspices. In numerous states, state welfare departments do take some leadership in social planning. Under licensing legislation in some states there is prescribed by statute the duty of the state department to determine need for a service before issuing a license to an agency to perform that service. In some additional states, broader duties of social planning and community organization are given the state departments by statute. There are many areas with no private agency service; certainly where there are private agencies, we feel that community planning should be a joint activity of private and public agencies.

In respect to item 5, regarding decentralization of direct services to children, the committee gave much thought to the exact wording. It felt that the present wording is an inclusive one and would be applicable to the large number of states having county units of service, but also to New England and a few other states having district offices of a state-administered, direct-care program. In my own field work with the latter group of states I have emphasized the need for decentralization through district offices where the county has little meaning in the state and one would

not wish to decentralize to the large number of towns. The last sentence of item 5 was added because it was realized that in some states adequate decentralization must come about somewhat gradually.

Item 9 is largely concerned with boards for state agencies. The last sentence regarding advisory committees applies only to local units, though until the very last draft of this Statement (the seventh draft) it applied to both state and local. With this change it is quite possible that this sentence should be a separate item. Perhaps it should be preceded by a sentence or sentences regarding local boards. I think the committee did not overlook the question of local policy-making boards comparable to the state policy-making board; it was felt that the variances in different states made this too complicated a question to go into in this particular Statement. For instance, I can see, in local units set up on a county basis, a policy-making board, but not such a board for district units of a state-administered, direct-care program, though the latter could well have, and personally I think should have, advisory committees.

In item 12, all of the committee felt that the approach to this program should be that indicated in the last sentence, namely, "continuing services based on an educational approach and with their [the agencies'] participation to define adequate standards." In my field work for the League I have found in various states what seemed to me to be much too legalistic an approach to licensing.* There sometimes is little or no contact between the state agency and the private agency to be licensed until just before time for renewal of the license, and then a study is made which is more of an inspection than a study. The annual review before the renewal of a license becomes much less important if there is a continuing relationship throughout the year and, in fact, I have found some states, doing an excellent job in respect to this continuing relationship, which do not have any set procedure for anything resembling an inspection just prior to renewal of a license. In those cases it is well known both to the state department and the agency concerned, long before the date for renewal of the license, just what is the status in that respect.

In respect to item 15, I note that one of your staff members feels that the state, not a local, public welfare department, should be involved in guardianship. Actually the final draft of the League's Statement does not go beyond stipulating that local public welfare departments, if asked to do so by the court, should make recommendations to the court as to suitable guardians, and secondly, that when it is necessary for a public agency to provide social serv-

ices for a child, including foster care, these should be vested in an administrative agency and preferably a local administrative agency. As the League's Statement now stands, there is no specific mention in item 15 of local welfare departments themselves serving, upon appointment by the court, as guardians of children, though some such statement was contained in an earlier draft. Thinking expressed in meetings of the committee at the time of that earlier draft was that where the court gives the guardianship of a child to a public agency, such guardianship should be vested in a local rather than a state administrative agency because of nearness to the person served and perhaps for additional reasons. Of course, all of this applies only where the court vests guardianship in a public agency; for very many children the court names individuals or private agencies to serve as guardians when there are no suitable guardians.

In respect to item 18, the primary aim of the League's committee was to enunciate the principle of purchase of care (not subsidy in any form). The committee made a distinction between per capita subsidy and purchase of care for an individual child similar to that made by Miss Arlien Johnson in an article in the September, 1948 issue of the *Social Service Review*. I quote from that article:

"The mingling of public and private funds, on the whole, is not in the interest of either the voluntary or the governmental agency, if each is to perform its role satisfactorily.

"A different relationship, however, is involved in the payment from public funds for specific services rendered to individual cases or patients by the voluntary agency. The latter may offer a kind of service not elsewhere provided, and the governmental agency may wish to purchase it for certain persons."

A distinction, of course, between per capita subsidy and purchase of care is that under the latter system the public welfare department originally accepts responsibility for the particular child and considers that a continuing responsibility (see first sentence of item 18). The League's Statement does not limit the amount of service which a given public agency might purchase from a given private agency; we are on record that the public agency has a "continuing obligation" in respect to each child for whom it is purchasing care.

May I again express our appreciation for your thoughtful comments, which will be definitely considered as the League works further in this general area as well as specifically in preparation for the final draft of this Statement.

MARGARET REEVES

* See "A State's Responsibility for its Children," by Margaret Reeves. *BULLETIN*, Child Welfare League of America. April, 1945.

BOOK NOTE

THE CREATIVE NURSERY CENTER, A UNIFIED SERVICE TO CHILDREN AND PARENTS: Winifred Y. Allen and Doris Campbell, Family Service Association of America, N. Y. 171 pp., 1948. \$2.75.

This book makes a decided contribution to the growing understanding by various professional groups of the value of an integrated approach in providing group programs for young children. The authors, Winifred Y. Allen, a kindergarten supervisor, and Doris Campbell, a professor of social work, have both had wide experience as consultants on day care programs. They point out that if the needs of young children are to be met, whether in nursery schools, day nurseries, day care centers or any equivalent services, the teacher, casework counselor, nurse, pediatrician and psychiatrist all must share in some

way in carrying out the program. The title "The Creative Nursery Center" conveys the concept which the authors have of the kind of program which takes into account the "wholeness of human personality."

The teacher, caseworker or pediatrician working in any day care center for young children will find of special interest the discussion of the importance of similar levels of competence in each professional field represented, and of the need for good administration if the teamwork is to be effective.

The book discusses the basic philosophy of group work programs for young children and emphasizes the fact that all members of the staff of a "creative center" must have a common understanding of human relationships.

EDNA MOHR,

Consultant on Nursery Schools, Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund, Chicago

CLASSIFIED AD SERVICE

Insertion of five lines of six words each is made at the minimum rate of \$2.50. For each additional line, or a fraction thereof, the charge is 50 cents. Closing date is the eighth of the month prior to the month of issue. A check should accompany the order.

STAFF WORKER for national agency offering advisory and consultative service to institutions and agencies related to Episcopal Church. Qualifications include MSW and experience in administration or community organization. In reply state training, experience, and range of salary to Rev. Arnold Purdie, 281 Fourth Ave., New York 10.

CASEWORKER—Multiple function private child-care agency, to work with children in foster home and institution placement. Graduate accredited school of social work. Experience preferred. Salary \$2950 to \$4300 commensurate with experience. Good personnel practices and supervision. Affiliated with Child Welfare League. Write Jewish Child Care Association of Essex County, 15 Lincoln Park, Newark 2, N. J.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY for Protestant child care agency in eastern Pennsylvania county. (Member child Welfare League of America.) Graduate of accredited school of social work. Some supervisory experience required. Salary commensurate with qualifications and experience. Write Miss Ora Pendleton, Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania, 311 S. Juniper St., Philadelphia 7, Pa.

ASSISTANT CONSULTANT to work with private licensed child caring institutions and agencies in metropolitan area. Consultation on cases as well as studies for purpose of licensing. Graduation from accredited school—experience in children's institution or placement agency. Possible opportunity to supervise field work students. \$3540 to \$4020. Write Gunnar Dybwad, State Department of Social Welfare, Lansing 4, Mich.

CASEWORKER—Opening for resident caseworker for adolescent boys in small nonsectarian agency near Chicago. Must be fully trained with supervised experience in children's agency. Salary dependent upon qualifications. New buildings for staff and boys. Write Arden Shore Association, Lake Bluff, Illinois.

CASEWORKER — Multiple function Methodist child care agency desires caseworker with minimum of one year of training in recognized school of social work, to work under experienced supervision with children in institutions, foster homes and adoption. Write to F. Reid Isaac, Superintendent, Board of Child Care, 516 N. Charles St., Baltimore 1, Md.

SUPERVISOR—Opening in family-children's service agency for professionally trained supervisor of casework. Salary range comparable with good agency practice. Information given upon inquiry. Write Director, Catholic Social Service Bureau, 478 Orange St., New Haven 2, Conn.

CASEWORKER for child placement agency. Trained. Experience with foster care, unwed parents and adoptions preferred. CWLA member. Consulting psychiatrist. Close supervision and limited load. Student unit. Salary range \$2700-\$3900. Children's Bureau, 225 N. Jefferson Street, Dayton, Ohio.

CASEWORKER—For extramural casework with teen-age girls in residence institution. Program is dynamic and experimental. Experience and training in child welfare required. Colorado Children's Aid Society, Denver, Col.

OPPORTUNITIES in adoption specialization, general child placement, and family casework. Casework openings in large reorganized multiple service agency; good supervision, student training program, psychiatric consultation. Reasonable caseloads and good personnel practices. Beginning salary \$2700 and in accord with experience. Family & Children's Service, 410 Liberty Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa.

CASEWORKER for Child Placement Department in multiple service agency. Prefer experienced practitioner but will consider beginner. Salary range \$2700 to \$4500, depending on qualifications. Jewish Family and Children's Service, 15 Fernando St., Pittsburgh 19, Pa.

CASEWORKER private, Protestant home for children, 53 children, ages 5 to 15. Cottage plan. Need caseworker to help develop modern child care program. Psychiatric consultation. MSS required. Living-in salary \$2500-\$2800. Living-out salary adjusted accordingly. Write Executive Director, The Children's Home, 555 Shelburne Rd., Burlington, Vt.

VACANCY in private agency for caseworker professionally trained with some experience. Limited caseload. Psychiatric consultation. Richmond Children's Aid Society, Allison Building, Richmond 19, Virginia.

CASEWORKERS for combined family and children's agency. Excellent personnel practices. Pleasant working conditions. Good supervision. Salary according to training and experience. Write Family & Children's Service, 313 S. E. Second St., Evansville, Ind.

MARY IRENE ATKINSON SPEAKING FOR CHILDREN

By Cheney C. Jones and Gertrude Springer, Editors
Parthenon Press, Nashville, Tenn. 1949. 192 pp. \$2.50.

A book not about but rather of Mary Irene Atkinson prepared by friends as a living memorial that many may have a comradeship which some of us were privileged to enjoy.

For students, board members and staff members interested in a bird's-eye view of the development in services to children as seen through the eyes of a "Great Friend of Children."

Also available through
CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, Inc.

NEW LEAGUE PUBLICATION

Discipline in the Child Care Institution, by David
Hallowitz and William Singer. 1950. 24 pp. 45c.

A pamphlet for all those working with children, individually or in groups.

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, Inc. 24 West 40th Street, New York 18, N. Y.

Officers

MRS. RICHARD J. BERNHARD, 1st Vice-Pres. NEW YORK	LEONARD W. MAYO, President NEW YORK	MISS LOULA DUNN, 2d Vice-Pres. CHICAGO	MISS E. MARGUERITE GANE, 3d Vice-Pres. BUFFALO
MISS EMMA C. PUSCHNER, 4th Vice-Pres. INDIANAPOLIS	REV. JOHN J. LENNON, 5th Vice-Pres. NEW YORK	SPENCER H. CROOKES, Exec. Dir. NEW YORK	MRS. HERBERT F. FISHER, Treasurer HARTFORD, CONN.
MISS GRACE A. REEDER, Secretary ALBANY			

Board of Directors

HERSCHEL ALT, New York, N. Y.	DR. HERMAN HILLEBOE, Albany, N. Y.	RANDEL SHAKE, Indianapolis, Ind.
MRS. RICHARD L. BOWDITCH, Cambridge, Mass.	MRS. HENRY HITCHCOCK, St. Louis, Mo.	WALTER N. THAYER, New York, N. Y.
MRS. GEORGE P. EDMONDS, Wilmington, Del.	MRS. J. HORTON LAMS, New York, N. Y.	WALTER P. TOWNSEND, Philadelphia, Pa.
GEORGE FAHEY, Seattle, Washington	ROBERT L. KINNEY, New York, N. Y.	MALCOLM VILAS, Cleveland, Ohio
MRS. KENDAL FROST, Los Angeles, Calif.	MISS KATHARINE F. LENROOT, Washington, D.C.	MRS. GEORGE L. WEST, Pittsburgh, Pa.
MRS. JOE HUME GARDNER, Washington, D.C.	ROBERT McDOUGAL, Jr., Chicago, Ill.	MISS LOIS WILBY, Chicago, Ill.
ALAN S. GEISMER, Cleveland, Ohio	MRS. CHARLES S. MONROE, New York, N. Y.	ROBERT W. WILLIAMS, Philadelphia, Pa.
SHELBY M. HARRISON, New York, N. Y.	C. F. RAMSAY, Ann Arbor, Mich.	MRS. RAY W. WILLOUGHBY, San Angelo, Texas
C. ELLIS HENICAN, New Orleans, La.		BENJAMIN YOUNGDAHL, St. Louis, Mo.